



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/534,403	03/22/2000	Yu Minakuchi	1341.1041/JDH	8398

21171 7590 11/21/2003  
STAAS & HALSEY LLP  
SUITE 700  
1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W.  
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER

MIRZA, ADNAN M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER 15
----------	-----------------

2141

DATE MAILED: 11/21/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARK  
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED APPLICANT	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
--------------------	-------------	-----------------------	---------------------

09534403 03/22/00 Yu Murakuchi 1341-1041

EXAMINER
----------

MIRZA

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2141 15

DATE MAILED:

INTERVIEW SUMMARY

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) MARK THOMPSON USPTO (3) ADNAN MIRZA USPTO  
(2) MEHDI SHEIKERZ #41307 (4)

Date of Interview 11/20/03

Type: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Televideo Conference ☒ Personal (copy is given to ☐ applicant ☒ applicant's representative).

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☒ Yes ☐ No If yes, brief description: Applicant discussed the invention and it was concluded that external server controlled

Agreement ☐ was reached. ☒ was not reached. client reproduction/rendering of real time of stream of data.

Claim(s) discussed: 3 & 11

Identification of prior art discussed: Yao et al, Asamizuya et al

**NOTE: CLAIMED INVENTION CURRENTLY RELIES ON (A) SERVER SCHEDULING & (B) SERVER CONTROLS CLIENT RENDERING.**

Applicant basically discussed the prior art on the record and pointed out the difference between the prior art and Applicant's invention. There was no agreement was reached. There were two points to the invention was scheduling and reproduction/rendering by the client. (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary. A FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an attachment to another form.

MARC D. THOMPSON  
MARC THOMPSON  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
GPO 2142